

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 and 16-17 are presently active, Claims 9-15 have been previously canceled without prejudice, Claims 1, and 16-17 are amended. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, the specification was objected to because of informalities. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of informalities. Claims 1-8 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-8 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Claims 1 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Kitsutaka (U.S. Pat. No. 7,042,463).

Regarding the objection to the specification, the amendment of the specification filed on October 11, 2005 and the original specification are amended to address the informalities. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the specification is overcome.

Regarding the objection to the abstract of the disclosure, the abstract is amended to address the informalities. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the specification is overcome.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection, Claim 17 is amended to be directed to a computer readable medium including a processing program to cause a computer to make a video processing apparatus perform the recited process. Further, Claims 1-8 and 16-17 are amended to clarify displaying an anti-aliased foreground image. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection is overcome.

In this regard, the Office Action asserts that the specification at page 17, lines 16-18 defines the program storage medium as a transmission medium which is a signal. Applicants note that the specification at page 17, lines 16-18 states "... the invention may be

implemented as computer software, which may be supplied on a storage medium *or via* a transmission medium such as a network or the internet.” Namely, the specification merely describes that the computer software may be supplied via a transmission medium such as a network or the internet. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification does not define the program storage medium as a signal.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of Claims 1-8 and 16-17, Claims 1, 16-17 are amended to clarify that the first processing superpose said primitive-processed image *signals* over said image background. This step corresponds to Step 1520 of the non-limiting embodiment, and is fully supported by, for example, the specification at page 17, lines 5-6. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection is overcome.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of Claims 1 and 16-17, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is overcome because, in Applicants’ view, amended independent Claims 1 and 16-17 patentably distinguish over Kitsutaka as discussed below.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “generating original foreground image signals by manipulation of a contiguous group of graphics primitives,” “applying anti-aliasing filtering to edges of each primitive of said group of graphics primitives to generate primitive-processed image signals,” “first processing said primitive-processed image signals to superpose said primitive-processed image signals over said image background” and “second processing said original foreground image signals to draw said original foreground image over said primitive-processed image.”

Instead, Kitsutaka describes ascribing to an image an alpha-value corresponding to the depth (Z) value, and overlaying the image on a defocused version of the image. Thus, a sharp original image becomes most prominent near the foreground, while the defocused image becomes most prominent in the background. In short, Kitsutaka discloses that two elements,

a sharp foreground image and a defocused background image, are blended according to a depth value.

However, Kitsutaka fails to disclose generating original foreground image signals and applying anti-aliasing filtering to edges of each primitive to generate primitive-processed image signals. Further, while Claim 1 recites superposing the primitive-processed images over the image background and drawing the original foreground image over the primitive-processed image, Kitsutaka does not disclose generating an image by using these three elements, the image background, the primitive-processed images and the original foreground image.

Thus, Kitsutaka fails to teach or suggest “generating original foreground image signals by manipulation of a contiguous group of graphics primitives,” “applying anti-aliasing filtering to edges of each primitive of said group of graphics primitives to generate primitive-processed image signals,” “first processing said primitive-processed image signals to superpose said primitive-processed image signals over said image background” and “second processing said original foreground image signals to draw said original foreground image over said primitive-processed image,” as recited in Claim 1.


Similar arguments set forth above apply to Claims 16-17.

Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 16-17 patentably distinguish over Kitsutaka. Therefore, Claims 1 and 16-17 and the pending Claims 2-8 dependent from Claim 1 are believed to be allowable.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, it is believed that the outstanding rejection is overcome, and the application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Edward W. Tracy
Registration No. 47,998

BDL\TY:pta

I:\ATTY\TYAMEND-RESPONSES\282536\282536 PROPOSED RESPONSE DUE OCT 25 2006.DOC